



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virgnia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/615,643	07/13/2000		Thomas L. Meredith	N-6089RSM	4680
23456	7590	12/19/2003		EXAMINER	
WADDEY			PELLEGRINO, BRIAN E		
414 UNION STREET, SUITE 2020 BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NASHVILL	NASHVILLE, TN 37219			3738	18
				DATE MAILED: 12/19/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		:	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/615,643	MEREDITH, THOMAS L.	
,, , ,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian E Pellegrino	3738	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 05 December 2003 FAILS TO PLATHEREOF, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Applexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli- (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in	
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{5}$ months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ace event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAY 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The chave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three managements.	than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. ension and the corresponding amount of the ed statutory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee are fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in	
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	· ·		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension.thereof (37 C			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	·	terially reducing or simplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without canc	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.	•		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		separate, timely filed amendment	
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	S:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-18 and 32</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 19 and 2	<u>11-31</u> .		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) a		the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem			
10. Other:		PaulRela	

Paul B. Prebilic Primary Examiner

Application No.



Continuation of 2. NOTE:

The new limitations that the composite is "self-supportive" and that it maintains a "rigid form before and after surgical implantation" requires further consideration and a search. Also the Applicant has failed to specifically point out the support in the original disclosure for each of the newly presented claim limitations (M.P.E.P. 714.02).